

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-6010

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

LAWRENCE BERNARD GARRISON,

Defendant - Appellant,

No. 03-6011

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

LAMONT HAROLD GARRISON,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. James C. Cacheris, Senior District Judge. (CR-98-132, CA-01-647-AM, CA-01-773-AM)

Submitted: May 29, 2003

Decided: June 3, 2003

Before WILKINSON, MICHAEL, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Charles Frederick Daum, Arlington, Virginia; David Elliot Kenner, Encino, California, for Appellants. Morris Rudolph Parker, Jr., Assistant United States Attorney, James L. Trump, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Lawrence Bernard Garrison and Lamont Harold Garrison seek to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on their motions filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000). An appeal may not be taken from the final order in a § 2255 proceeding unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2000). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that his constitutional claims are debatable and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or wrong. See Miller-El v. Cockrell, 123 S. Ct. 1029, 1040 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir.), cert. denied, 534 U.S. 941 (2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that neither Appellant has made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny certificates of appealability and dismiss the appeals. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED